

REMARKS

We have amended the claims to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. We have also added new claims 24-28, which depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1.

We acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 12-17 are allowed.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. 5,890,789 to Inagaki et al. (Inagaki) in view of U.S. 5,359,434 to Nakao et al. (Nakao). The Examiner admits that Inagaki:

...does not specifically disclose a diffractive element which generates an array of input beams from the deflected beams; and a control circuit which during operation generates the AOD control signal and varies a characteristic of the first control signal to account for errors in the scanning system.

To supply that which is missing, the Examiner turns to Nakao. For the diffractive element, the Examiner directs our attention to col. 1, lines 67-68 and col. 2, lines 1-13 and for the control circuit he directs our attention to col. 9, lines 17-28.

With regard to the diffractive element, we note that the portions to which the Examiner directs our attention do not mention or even suggest the presence of a diffractive element. Indeed, we could find no reference whatsoever to Nakao using a diffractive element. A search of the text of the Nakao patent revealed that Nakao never even uses the word "diffractive" or "diffraction" to describe his system.

With regard to the control circuit, we note that Nakao does not teach or suggest correcting for the types of errors that are now recited in claim 1, as amended. More specifically, Nakao does not have:

...a control circuit which during operation generates the AOD control signal and varies a characteristic of the AOD control signal to account for errors in the scanning system, said errors attributable to at least one of (1) variations in beam velocity over a scan line within the scanning system, (2) intensity errors associated with the scanning system, and (3) intensity variations from stripe deflection across a sound field within the AOM

The Examiner appears to have recognized this since the Examiner relied on yet another reference (U.S. 6,731,320 to Allen) to reject claims 4-11, some of which introduced the errors now recited in amended claim 1.

With regard to accounting for errors attributable to variation in beam velocity, the Examiner directs our attention to col. 4, lines 31-34, which states:

Scanning element 240 directs multiple scan beams 249 into post-scan optics 250. Scanning element 240 is preferably a rotating polygon mirror that during scanning rotates with a constant angular velocity.

But we could find nothing in that text or anywhere else in Allen for that matter which teaches or suggests “a control circuit which during operation generates the AOD control signal and varies a characteristic of the AOD control signal to account for errors in the scanning system, said errors attributable to...variations in beam velocity over a scan line within the scanning system,” as recited in claim 1.

With regard to accounting for errors attributable to intensity errors associated with the scanning system, the Examiner directs our attention to col. 7, lines 8-10, which states:

Returning to FIG. 2, rasterizer 224 controls the intensity of the individual beams to form an image containing a rectangular array of uniformly sized pixels.

But we could find nothing in that text or anywhere else in Allen for that matter which teaches or suggests “a control circuit which during operation generates the AOD control signal and varies a characteristic of the AOD control signal to account for errors in the scanning system, said errors attributable to...intensity errors associated with the scanning system,” as recited in claim 1.

With regard to accounting for errors attributable to intensity variations from stripe deflection across a sound field within the AOM, the Examiner again directs our attention to col. 7, lines 8-10, which was quoted above. But we could find nothing in that text or anywhere else in Allen for that matter which teaches or suggests “a control circuit which during operation generates the AOD control signal and varies a characteristic of the AOD control signal to account for errors in the

scanning system, said errors attributable to... intensity variations from stripe deflection across a sound field within the AOM,” as recited in claim 1.

For the reasons stated above, we believe that the claims are in condition for allowance and therefore ask the Examiner to allow them to issue.

Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 24, 2008

/Eric L. Prah/

Eric L. Prah/

Registration No.: 32,590

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 526-6000 (telephone)
(617) 526-5000 (facsimile)